

REMARKS

In response to the Office Action of October 7, 2010, claims 1, 22, 25, 32 and 41 have been amended to recite directly identifying the wireless terminal to the at least one other communicating party “so that said at least one other communicating party knows the current public address it has been notified of is the current public address of said wireless terminal.” Support for this amendment can be found in the application as filed, including at page 14, lines 4-10.

Claim Rejections- 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph

At section 3 of the Office Action, claims 1-12, 22, 25-28, 32 and 41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention. Specifically, it is asserted that it is indefinite in claims 1, 22, 25, 32 and 41, whether the communicating party knows or does not know of whose current public address it has been notified.

Applicants have amended these independent claims to recite that said “at least one other communicating party knows the current public address...” Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that as amended, claims 1, 22, 25, 32 and 41 and their dependent claims are definite and are in allowable form.

Claim Rejections- 35 U.S.C. §102

At section 6 of the Office Action, claims 1-8, 10-12, 22, 25-28, 32 and 41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Wu et al (US 7,039,721, hereinafter Wu).

With respect to claims 1, 22, 25 and 32, it is asserted by the Office that Wu discloses a system as claimed, with reference made to Figure 1; column 3, lines 52-55; column 4, line 25; column 5, lines 37-57; column 6, lines 1-25 and 42-51; and column 6, line 62—column 7, line 4. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Claim 1 has been amended to recite that dynamically notifying comprises directly identifying said wireless terminal to said at least one other communicating party so that said at least one other communicating party knows the current public address it has been notified

of is the current public address of said wireless terminal. Thus, as amended, claim 1 recites that the at least one other communicating party knows that the current public address belongs to the wireless terminal, not to some other device or terminal. Wu fails to disclose this feature.

The secret host of Wu, which the Office has interpreted as the wireless terminal of the present invention, is never identified to other parties. Wu states at column 6, lines 1-7:

The secret host 18 accepts IP packets from the public host 22 and processes them accordingly. The secret host 18 responds by sending packets out with the public host IP address so that it appears that all data is coming from the public host 22 when it is actually being sent directly from the secret host. This further protects the identity of the secret host 18.

Applicant previously amended the claim to recite the “at least one communicating party can know of whose current public address it has been notified.” In the Response to Arguments section of the Office Action, the Office states:

While the Examiner agrees that the secret host in Wu uses the public host IP address so that the recipient believes it is receiving packets from the public host, the Examiner believes Wu still reads on the limitation “so that the at least one other communicating party can know of whose current public address it has been notified.” The Applicants point out that Wu discloses the recipient believes it is receiving packets from the public host. Thus, Wu discloses that the at least one other communicating party knows of whose current public address it has been notified. The recipient of Wu does not know that the secret host sends the packets but the recipient of Wu knows that it has been notified the public host IP address because the packets sent by the secret host include the public host IP address. (emphasis added)

The recipient in Wu believes it has been notified of the public IP address of the public host. The recipient clearly has no knowledge of the secret host/“wireless terminal”. The purpose of using the public host in Wu is to protect the identity of the secret host so that recipients are unaware of the secret host. Thus, the recipient in Wu cannot know that the public host IP address is the current public address of the secret host/“wireless terminal”, as set forth in claim 1 as amended, because the recipient believes it is communicating with the public host and has no knowledge of the secret host.

Therefore, because Wu fails to disclose dynamically notifying further comprises directly identifying said wireless terminal to said at least one other communicating party so

that said at least one other communicating party knows the current public address it has been notified of is the current public address of the wireless terminal, it is respectfully submitted that claim 1 as amended is in allowable form and is not suggested in view of the cited references.

Independent claims 22, 25, 32, and 41 have all been amended in a manner similar to claim 1 and, for similar reasons as those presented above, each of these independent claims is also believed to be neither anticipated nor suggested by Wu.

Furthermore, at least in view of their dependency on the aforementioned independent claims, it is respectfully submitted that dependent claims 2-8, 10-12, and 26-28 are also not anticipated by Wu and are in allowable form.

At section 9 of the Office Action, claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wu, in view of Mehta, and in further view of Ebata et al. (US 2002/0173310, hereinafter Ebata). However, because claim 9 is dependent from claim 1, which as stated above is not anticipated by Wu, it is respectfully submitted that claim 9 is not unpatentable over Wu, in view of Mehta, in further view of Ebata and is in allowable form.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the present application as amended is in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: January 7, 2011

/Steven T. Cooper/

WARE, FRESSOLA, VAN DER SLUYS
& ADOLPHSON LLP
Bradford Green, Building Five
755 Main Street, P.O. Box 224
Monroe, CT 06468
Telephone: (203) 261-1234
Facsimile: (203) 261-5676

Steven T. Cooper
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 67,516